Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

view-point the object appears to an observer to have a certain quality, what happens to the object when the observer leaves his post and thereby reduces the latter to a mere possible view-point?" (p. 156). I should answer that such qualities as were contributed to the object by the observer *out of his own nature* would vanish when he ceased to perceive the object, while those qualities which had come from the object to the observer and which he had *merely reflected* back to their source would remain. The same sort of problem would arise if we were to look at the landscape through a bit of colored glass, and then remove the glass. The features which the landscape owed to the glass it would cease to have, while those other qualities which the glass merely transmitted and did not confer, would remain. The latter would be more real because more permanent, but the former qualities would have really pertained to the landscape during the time when it was observed through the glass. The determination of the various methods for eliminating the personal equation and introducing harmony and compossibility into the vast concourse of physical qualities presented to us by nature is the business of common sense supplemented by the several sciences.

In conclusion, I can not help reminding Professor Bode that neither the relativity of natural objects nor the relativity of human knowledge is a result of my hypothesis. They had their being before the hypothesis was formed. And so while I agree with my critic that a universe of relativity is in many respects very unsatisfactory, and that in such a universe it is a matter of great difficulty to discover the real and absolute nature of things, I must decline to believe that that difficulty is in any wise aggravated by calling attention to its existence.

W. P. MONTAGUE.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

SOCIETIES

SECTION OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY OF THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

A MEETING was held in conjunction with the New York Branch of the American Psychological Association on February 24, 1908. The usual afternoon session was adjourned to hear a lecture by Professor Titchener, at Columbia University, on "The Laws of Attention," in which he discussed the question as to the number of distinguishable levels of clearness which are simultaneously present in the same consciousness. After a comprehensive review of the literature and a careful examination of the doctrines which hold to three or four levels, the lecturer concluded that there was no real evidence of more than two distinct levels, that of clearness, or attention, and that of obscurity, or inattention. For example, in looking at one of the common puzzle pictures, in which a face is concealed, the moment the face appears to the observer the picture as a whole, which up to that moment had been clear, drops at once into obscurity, and there is no appearance of a gradual fading into obscurity through a series of intermediate gradations. It is true, however, that both at the level of obscurity and, more certainly still, at the level of clearness there may exist slight differences in the prominence of the different elements present. This is illustrated by the differing prominence of the different elements of a rhythm, even though all lie in the field of attention. There may also, as between different states of consciousness, be differences in the level of clearness and in that of obscurity; the narrower the field of attention, the greater is the disparity between the level of clearness and the level of obscurity.

An evening session was held at the American Museum of Natural History, at which the following communications were presented:

Professor H. C. Warren, in discussing "Feeling and Other Sensations," said that the supposed radical distinction between feeling and sensation was supported by three separate claims. (1) *Evidence from introspection.* This is inconclusive. Admitting the vast difference of sort between so-called feelings and visual sensations (*e. g.*), there appears quite as vast a difference of sort between visual, auditory, and other "external" sensations. (2) *Distinction between external and internal elements.* This affords no better criterion. The hedonic tone of a visual sensation (*e. g.*) has just as definite a physical basis as its brightness or color characters. Organic conditions are less clear-cut than external stimuli, but difference in *degree* of clearness is no reason for dividing experience into two elemental *sorts.* Moreover, a distinction based on source should recognize activity experience also. The speaker prefers the terms external, organic, and kinesthetic sensations to a more radical division into sensations, feelings, and activity experiences. (3) *Different genetic roles of presentation and affection.* "External" sensations lead more readily to thought and "knowledge about" things than internal. But this is due to the relative vagueness of the latter. Definite, vivid experiences lead to perception, judgment, reasoning; indefinite, vague experiences lead to nothing beyond themselves. Yet any experience, even of discomfort or well-being, may at times become focused in attention and form the basis of a judgment. The distinction between presentative and affective is, therefore, not really based on the nature of stimuli. Intellectual experience is the result of a distinctive mental function which acts (in favorable circumstances) on sensory experiences of any sort.—The three claims for a radical dichotomy of experience are thus found to be unsatisfactory. All simple experience is essentially one in nature.

Mr. Warner Brown reported on his experimental study of "Time in Verse." A large number of graphic records of the voice were made the basis of the report. The material embraced nonsense verses and typical verses of English poetry. The former failed to show any differences of *tempo* between the four common rhythms, and the differences of internal time relations of the feet were not found to be those usually accepted. Syllables in trochees are nearly equal in length, but the accented is shorter. The accented syllable of the dactyl is not longer than the corresponding short syllable of the anapest. If two short syllables are taken as equivalent to one, no sharp line can be drawn between two-syllable and three-syllable rhythms in respect to time. In lines of poetry the conventional alternation of long and short syllables is frequently reversed, leaving the time structure chaotic. The feet approximate equality only in the very simplest verse. There is no regular connection between accent and duration. None of the three-syllable rhythms took the form given by the dactyl in nonsense verse. The general conclusion was that the ear is incompetent to judge, and that the impression of temporal regularity in verse is strictly illusory.

Mr. H. L. Hollingworth reported an experimental study of "The Time of Movement." This report described an instrument designed to record simultaneously and graphically the extent, duration, and force of a rectilinear arm movement. To the car of the Cattell-Fullerton extent of movement apparatus is attached a signal magnet, which controls the vibrations of an enlarged Pfeil time marker. On a smoked paper, stretched on a horizontal frame, the writing point traces the extent of the movement and records the time in twentieths of a second. The interruptions are made by means of a reed oscillator. The car pulls against a set of springs, which are adjustable, so that the force may be varied independently of the extent, but correlated with it empirically. A pulley attachment provides for the use of weights instead of springs. The traditional method of controlling the extent of a movement by impact against an upright is found to cause a large positive constant error which is a function of the force of impact, and the magnitude of which increases the variable error. When the movement was blocked at one centimeter from the starting-point, the varying speeds, indicated in mm. per tenth of a second, gave the following results:

Speed	68	100	110
Constant error	+ 138 mm.	+ 174 mm.	+ 171 mm.
Variable error	30 "	42 "	41 "

When stopped at two centimeters:

Speed	32	120	138
Constant error	+ 100 mm.	+ 158 mm.	+ 166 mm.
Variable error	24 "	38 "	32 "

When stopped at three centimeters:

Speed	103	155
Constant error	+ 90 mm.	+ 132 mm.
Variable error	24 "	28 "

In order to eliminate this factor a sound hammer, introduced at optional points along the track, serves as a signal for stopping the movement. The movement is thus terminated by the subject himself and becomes a unit, commensurable with any other free movement.

Dr. Adolf Meyer, in discussing "The Concept of Substitutive Activity and the Relation of Mental Reaction Types to Psychiatric Nosology," noted as a characteristic sign of our times in psychopathology, as in other biological and extrabiological domains, the surrender of the quest for the final nature of events in terms of physicochemical materialism. The chase for the noumenon, or *Ding an sich,* has lost its charm. We realize that much of what is expressed in psychology or psychopathology in terms of nerve-cells is pseudo-scientific tautology, the facts on which the claims are based being extraneurological, and the inferences being often enough not only unverifiable, but directly opposed by what we know in terms of nerve histology and nerve physiology. This form of scientific mythology serves its purpose if it stimulates, but it ought not to be accepted as solution. It seems infinitely wiser to reduce events not to static principles, but to *simpler events,* and to study the laws of modifiability of the active factors and of the results. The notion of the "lesion" is helpful where facts are accessible; otherwise, it plays the role of a noumenon. Events are defined by the situation, the reaction, and the final adjustment, and the role played by parts of the event or parts of the mechanism. Abnormal events may be best accounted for by modification either of infrapsychical (simple physiological) or of mental (physiological-psychological) factors. Since the mental events constitute adjustive actions with a scale of efficiency or lack of efficiency, we can distinguish the well-planned act, poorly supported by faulty physiological mechanisms, from inadequately *planned,* inferior reactions; and the latter we designate as substitutive activities, to denote that the fault lies more in the deficiency of the mental adaptation itself than in that of the tool of the same. The advantage lies in the fact that we do not telescope the facts into a schematic artifact devoid of a time component, with a craving for uncontrollable nerve-cell notions, but our attention remains faithful to the field in which things happen. The tendency of an overbelief in the value of noumena is further illustrated in the notion of a "disease," as soon as it figures as more than an empirical unit, satisfying the identification of certain combinations of manifestations, or of some issues of treatment, or not infrequently of a desire for protection against demands of responsibility concerning the outcome. The "disease" notion is hardly conspicuous in the plainest events of pathology, in injuries, intoxications, and even infection, but the nearer we get to the ill-defined, the more the term "disease entity" gets a noumenal overimportance. Consumption used to be a protective term covering up the inefficiency of management of tubercular infection; *dementia præcox* is to-day such a term covering up medical inefficiency in dealing with the so-called deterioration processes. Within their proper field and plainly realized limitations, the maintenance of these noumena has a great advantage for orderly thinking, but, like the neo-vitalistic modes of presentation of biological facts, they would be most detrimental if considered as more than formulas or starting-points of more fundamental work. For didactic and practical work the differentiation of unfavorable developments from harmless or from constitutional recurrent, but non-deteriorating, disorders is equally important for the physician and for the families. Hence the importance of a distinction of *dementia præcox* and manic-depressive insanity. But for progress in the understanding, a constructive knowledge of events has to supersede the purely formal method of what can only be a preliminary grouping, until the pertinent cases can be said to present experiments of nature with clearly known components, traced to simpler events rather than to artificial elements of psychology or neurology.

R. S. WOODWORTH,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.